## REMARKS

Claims 1-38 were pending in the application. Claims 1-15 and 17-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,099,408 to Schneier (hereinafter Schneier '408). Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Schneier '408. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

With respect to claim 1, applicants respectfully submit that Schneier '408 fails to teach a first-type commit/reveal sequence that commits an outcome generator to a set of outcomes. In one embodiment of the invention a dealer (outcome generator) shuffles a deck of cards and commits to its order by communicating a secured encoding of deck order to the player. See page 2, paragraph 5 of the specification. Thus, in that particular embodiment, the set of outcomes committed to is deck order. See claim 36. The outcome generator may commit to other outcomes as described in the specification.

The Office action points to col. 13, lines 45 to col. 14, line 3 of Schneier '408 to teach claim 1. However Schneier '408 teaches:

> [I]n one embodiment of the invention, a result value represents the complete sequence of fifty-two cards. Once the card sequence is defined based on the player random number and the game server random number, the cards can be dealt.
>
> For example, after generating an encoded player random number and transmitting it to game server 200, player terminal 300 receives the encoded game server random number. Player terminal 300 then transmits a decoding key to game server 200 which generates the result value representing the complete sequence of cards in the deck. Before sending a game server decoding key to player terminal 300, game server 200 sends the player card values representing a hand of cards dealt from the sequence of cards generated by the result value. If he desires, the player then selects to draw additional cards for his blackjack hand, again, from the defined sequence of cards. [Emphasis added]

Claim 1 recites that the first-type commit/reveal sequence commits an outcome generator to a set of outcomes. Schneier '408 teaches utilizing both player and game server random numbers to generate the deck order or card sequence. Schneier '408 teaches that the player

terminal sends an encoded random number. Then, the player terminal receives the encoded game server random number. Player terminal 300 then transmits a decoding key to game server 200 which generates the result value representing the complete sequence of cards in the deck. The encoded game server random number cannot commit the game server to a set of outcomes, because the player random number, which is decoded after sending the game server random number, is needed to determine the outcome. Thus, Schneier '408 fails to teach executing the nested first- and second-type commit/reveal sequences as recited in claim 1, in which the first-type commit/reveal sequence commits an outcome generator to a set of outcomes. Since Schneier '408 fails to teach the first commit/reveal sequence that commits an outcome generator to a set of outcomes, applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 and all claims dependent thereon distinguish over Schneier '408.

With regards to claim 11, Schneier '408 fails to teach transformationally securing an encoding of a predetermined set of outcomes (such as deck order) or supplying one or more players with the transformationally secured encoding. Schneier '408 teaches that the game server sends an encoded game server random number, then receives the player random numbers and the player random number keys, and then generates a result. Thus, applicants respectfully submit that claim 11 and all claims dependent thereon distinguish over the prior art of record, alone or in combination.

With regards to claim 20, the Office Action relies on Schneier '408, col. 12, line 36 to col. 13 line 24. That portion of Schneier '408 teaches that the game server transmits its encoded random number to the player terminals after the player terminals send their encoded random numbers. Game server 200 generates the game result after receiving the keys from the players. Thus, there is no teaching of receiving a transformationally secured encoding of a predetermined set of outcomes for a gaming transaction as required in claim 20. Neither the random numbers supplied by the players or by the game server is a transformationally secured encoding of a predetermined set of outcomes. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claim 20 and all claims dependent thereon distinguish over the references of record alone or in combination.

With regards to claim 25, applicants respectfully submit that Schneier '408 fails to teach a commitment sequence executable to supply one or more players with a transformationally

secured set of outcomes. As pointed out above, Schneier '408 teaches supplying a game server random number but the game server random number is not used as a commitment sequence that supplies one or more players with a transformationally secured set of outcomes. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claim 25 and all claims dependent thereon distinguish over the references of record.

Applicants note that the Office Action inadvertently omitted addressing independent claim 28. Applicants respectfully submit that Schneier '408 fails to teach a commitment sequence executable, after receipt of a transformationally secured encoding of a predetermined set of outcomes, to supplying a transformationally secured encoding of a player input. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claim 28 distinguishes over the references of record.

With regards to claim 29 applicants respectfully submit that Schneier '408 fails to teach first instructions executable to supply one or more players with a transformationally secured set of outcomes. As pointed out above, the random number supplied by the game server does not describe a set of outcomes. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claim 29 and all claims dependent thereon distinguish over the references of record.

With regards to claim 31 applicants respectfully submit that Schneier '408 fails to teach transformationally securing an encoding of a predetermined set of outcomes; supplying one or more players with the transformationally secured encoding; receiving a transformationally secured player index from each of the one or more players; selecting a particular one of the outcomes for revealing to the one or more players based on a combination of the player indices. As pointed out above, Schneier '408 fails to teach a transformationally secured encoding of a predetermined set of outcomes (such as deck order). Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claim 31 distinguishes over the references of record.

With regards to claim 35, applicants respectfully submit that Schneier '408 fails to teach a means for committing to a particular set of outcomes without revealing same. Schneier teaches generating a game server random number that is utilized to determine the result along with player random numbers, but the game server random number does not by itself commit the game

server to a particular set of outcomes such as deck order. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claim 35 distinguishes over Schneier '408.

Claim 38 recites committing a game server to a set of outcomes by supplying a transformationally secure encoding of the set of outcomes to one or more players and thereafter receiving from each player a commitment to a respective index contribution and after receiving the commitment from each player, receiving from each player a communication revealing each respective index contribution; and selecting from the set of outcomes based on a predefined combination operation on the index contributions; and thereafter the game server revealing the set of outcomes for validation thereof. Schneier '408 does not teach committing the game server to a set of outcomes by supplying a transformationally secure encoding of the set of outcomes to one or more players and thereafter receiving from each player a commitment to a respective index contribution. Thus, applicants respectfully submit that claim 38 distinguishes over Schneier '408.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, claims 1-38 are believed allowable and applicants respectfully request a notice to that effect. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that the Examiner believes could be resolved via a telephonic interview, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at the number listed below.

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that, on the date shown below, this correspondence is being

☐ deposited with the US Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

☐ facsimile transmitted to the US Patent and Trademark Office.

_____ _____
Date

**EXPRESS MAIL LABEL:** EV436536573US

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Zagorin, Reg. No. 36,067
Attorney for Applicant(s)
(512) 338-6311
(512) 338-6301 (fax)